

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/821,298	04/09/2004	James R. Mujwid	75028-307907	1231	
43541 WOOD, HER	7590 05/03/200 RON & EVANS (ZIMN	EXAM	EXAMINER		
2700 CAREW TOWER 441 VINE STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202			ARAJ, MICHAEL J		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3733		
	•				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/821,298	MUJWID ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael J. Araj	3733	

	Michael J. Araj	3733					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 19 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origon than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offite of the final rejection, of	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> </ol>	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause				
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	•				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			•				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ol>							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ii be entered and an e	explanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidate	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.				
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:							
$\sim$	//						
	EDUARDO AROBI SUPERVISORY	ERT YAMINER					
	DOLER INDOMINATE OF L						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Upon reading the arguments mailed on April 19,2007 the rejection remains. Claims 1,3-9, 15-21 and 32-37 are rejected and claims 10-14, 22 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any inervening claims. Applicant argues that figure 1 of McGuire et al. has the drive shaft at a fixed angular postion relative to the operating shaft. The device of Figure 1 is indeed fixed and does not permit the shaft to pivot relative to the attachment piece in a range of axial orientations relative to a longitudinal axis of the attachment piece in a response to a side torque being applied to the shaft, but the applicant is directed towards Figure 17 (or even Figure 9) which shows the drive shaft being able to pivot relative to the attachment piece. (Col. 12, lines 9-24. The claim limitations rejected in the final action are disclosed in McGuire et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,797,918).